# THE COMMUNIST

ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

Official Organ of the Communist Party of America

Vol. II., No. 9 | SEPTEMBER 1, 1920 | PRICE 5 CENTS


# Thesis of the Executive Committee of the Communist International

**Presented to the Second Congress on the Role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution.**

The first year's activity of the Communist International was devoted principally to propaganda and spreading of Communist ideas. At the present moment, before the Second Congress of the Communist International, the world wide organization of the proletariat is entering a new phase: the Communist International is entering the period of organization and construction. Hitherto in the various countries there existed only Communist tendencies amongst the workers. At the present moment, in nearly every country where there is a serious working-class movement, we have no longer tendencies, but Communist organizations and parties. This circumstance must move the Second Congress of the International to take up a perfectly clear and exact position on the subject of the of the role of the Communist Party before and after the conquest of power by the working class. Amongst certain supporters of Communism (the "Left" movement in Germany, the supporters of the I. W. W. in America, certain groups of revolutionay Syndicalists and Anarchists) there may be noticed an insufficient estimate of the role of the Communist Party, as such, and even a direct denial of the necessity of the existence of a Communist Party. This will serve as an additional motive to impel the Second Congress of the Communist International clearly and definitely to deal with the question stated above.

(1) The Communist Party is a section of the working class. To be more precise, its most advanced, its most class-conscious, and therefore, its most revolutionary section. The Com- Communist Party has no interests distinct from those of the working class. The party is distinguished from the general mass of the workers by the fact that it reviews the whole historical development of hte working class in its entirety and strives at every turning point in that path, to defend the interests not of separate professions, but of the working class as a whole. The Communist Party is that lever of political organization with the help of which the foremost section of the working class guides along the right road the whole mass of the proletariat and semi-proletariat.

(2) Until the time when state power has been conquered by the proletariat, until the time when the proletariat has once and for all firmly established its supremacy, and has secured the working class against a bourgeois restoration—until that time the Communist Party will naturally include in its organized ranks only a minority of the workers. Until the seizure of power, and in the transitional period, the Communist Party may, under favorable circumstances, enjoy and undivided ideo-political influence on all the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements of the population, but cannot unite them in an organized fashion within its ranks. Only when the proletarian dictatorship has deprived the capitalist class of such mighty weapons as the press, the school, parliament, the church, the apparatus of government, etc., only when the final defeats of the bourgeois order becomes apparent to all—only then will all, or nearly all, the workers begin to enter the ranks of tht Communist Party.

(3) The idea of a party must be very strictly distinguished from the idea of a class. The members of the "Christian" and the liberal professional unions of Germany, England, and other countries are undoubtedly a section of the working class. The more or less considerable masses of workers who still support the Scheidemanns, Gompers and Co., are undoubtedly a section of the working class. In given historical circumstances there may be present in the working class reactionary strains of large numerica strength. The problem of Communism does not consist in the Party adapting itself to these backward section of the working class, but in raising the whole working class to the level of its Communist vanguard. The confusion of these two ideas—party and class—may lead to the greatest possible mistakes and chaos. Thus, for example, it is clear that, in spite of the mood or the prejudices, defending the historical interests of the proletariat—interests which demanded on the part of the proletarian party a declaration of war against war.

Thus, for example, at the beginning of the imperialist war in 1914, the social-traitors of all countries supporting the bourgeoisie of "their" country, with common accord adduced in their defense the claim that such was the will of the working class, and they forgot that, even if this were not so, the duty of the proletarian pary, under such conditions, was to declare itself against the opinion of the majority of the workers and to defend the historical interests of the proletariat in spite of all. Thus, in the early years of the twentieth century, the Russian Mensheviks of the time the so called "economists" repudiated an open political struggle against Tsarism on the basis that, forsooth, the working class as a whole had not yet attained to an understanding of the political struggle.

(4) The Communist International is unshakably convinced that the collapse of the old "social-democratic" parties of the 2nd International can in no wise be represented as a collapse of proletarian party life altogether. The period of direct struggle of the dictatorship of the proletariat gives birth to a new party of the proletariat—the Communist Party.

(5) The Communist International decisively repudiates the view that the proletariat can in any way accomplish its revolution without having its own independent political party. Every class struggle is a political struggle. The aim of that struggle, inevitably transforming itself into a civil war, is the conquest of political power. But political power cannot be assumed, organized, and directed except by one political party or another. Only in the case when the proletariat has a guide an organized and experienced party, with strictly defined aims and a concretely worked out program of immediate activity both in internal and in external politics, will the conquest of political power not be a mere accidental episode, but will serve as the point of departure of a prolonged period of Communist reconstruction by the proletariat.

The same class struggle requires the centralization at one point of the general direction of the various forms of the proletarian movement (the Trade Unions, the Cooperative, factory and workshop committees, educational work, elections, and so forth). Only a political party can act as a general unifying and guiding centre of this kind. The refusal to create and strengthen it, and to be controlled by it, signifies a refusal to admit unity of control of the isolated fighting detachments of the proletariat serving on various fronts. Finally, the class struggle of the proletariat requires concentrated agitation, throwing light on the various stages of the struggle from a single point of view, and concentrating the attention of the proletariat at every given moment on definite problems common to the whole of the working class. This cannot be achieved without a centralized political apparatus, that is, without a political party. Consequently, the propaganda of the revolutionary syndicalists and of the supporters of the Industrial Workers of the World against the necessity of an independent working class party, objectively speaking, has helped, and helps, only the capitalist class and counter revolutionary "Social Democrats." In their propaganda against the Communist Party, which the syndicalists and the industrialists wish to replace by Trade Unions alone, or by formless "General" Labor Unions, they come on to common ground with acknowledged opportunists. The Russian Mensheviks, after the defeat of the 1905 revolution, for several years preached a so-called "Labor Conference," which was to take the place of the revolutionary party of the working class. All kinds of "Laborists" in England and America, who in practice are openly engaged in carrying out bourgeois policy, preach to the workers the creation of shapeless "Labor Unions" in place of a political party. The revolutionary syndicalists and industrialists are anxious to struggle against the dictatorship of the capitalist class, but do not know how to set about it. They do not notice that the working class without an independent political party is a body without a head.

Revolutionary syndicalism and industrialism represent a step forward only in comparison with the old, worn out, counter revolutionary ideology of the Second International. But, in comparison with revolutionary Marxism, i. e., with Communism, syndicalism and industrialism represent a step back. The declaration of the "Left" Communists of Germany (made by them in their program statement at their first congress in April) to the effect that they are creating a party, "but not a party in the usual, traditional sense of the word" ("Keine Partei im überlieferteten Sinne")—is a surrender to those views of syndicalism and industrialism which are in essence reactionary.

(6) The Communists whole-heartedly support the formation, side by side with the Communist Party, of tht widest possible non-party Labor organizations. The Communists consider as their most important task a systematic work of organization and education within these wide labor organizations. But, precisely to ensure that this work will bear fruit, precisely to ensure that the enemies of the revolutionary proletariat will not gain possession of these organizations, the foremost working class Communists must always have their independent, strongly organized Communist Party, acting always in an organized way, and be capable of defending the general interests of Communism at every turn of events and in all forms of the movement.

(7) The Communists do not avoid the mass non-party working class organizations even when they bear an openly reactionary, "Black Hundred," character (the "Yellow" Unions, the "Christian" Unions, and so on). But the Communist Party ceaselessly carries on its own work within these organizations, and untiringly demonstrates to the workers that the non-party idea, as a principle, is consciously fostered amongst the workers by the capitalist class and its lackeys, in order to divert the proletariat from the organized struggle for Socialism.

(8) The old "classical" division of the working class movement into three forms (the Party the Trade Unions, and the Cooperatives) has obviously outlived its usefulness. The Proletarian Revolution in Russia has produced the fundamental form of working class dictatorship – the Soviets. But work in the Soviets also, just as in the revolutionized producers' unions, must unswervingly and systematically be guided by the party of the proletariat, i. e., by the Communis Party. The Communist Party, the organized vanguard of the working class, simultaneously serves the interests of the economic, the political, and the educational struggles of the working class, in their entirety. The Communist Party must appear as the head and soul of the producers' unions, of the Councils of Workers' Deputies, and of all other forms of proletarian oranization.

The appearance of Soviets as the chief form, historically speaking, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in no way diminishes the guiding role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution. The German "Left" Communists free the appeal of their party to the German proletariat, April 11th, 1920, signed, "The Com

(Continued on page 3)

## One Day's Pay

**The second convention of the Communist Party adopted a resolution calling upon the members to contribute ONE DAY'S PAY for the party organization.**

In accordance with the decision of the Convention, the C. E. C. issues this call to all members of the Communist Party to contribute one day's pay for the national organization.

Comrades, the need is great. You know it. We need not waste time and space telling you about it.

The Communist Party is unified and solidified on the basis of principles and tactics as never before in its history.

There are difficult tasks ahead of us—organization, education, propaganda, and agitation.

The spirit, the will, the determination the energy exists to carry on this highly important work.

BUT WITHOUT FUNDS WE CANNOT CARRY ON!

Comrades! Rally to the support of the Communist Party!

GIVE ONE DAY'S PAY TO MAKE THE PARTY A PARTY OF ACTION.

# THE COMMUNIST

Official organ of
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA
published by the
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vol. II. September 1, 1920 No. 9


## Wilson's Last Note.

Capitalism is sick and dying and it is fitting that a sick and discredited man should be its chief theoretician and spokesman.

Woodrow Wilson once fascinated the bourgeois world with his diplomatic notes, "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Out of his poor paralyzed brain there issues another, his latest, perhaps his last, on the Russian question.

Wilson speaking for that dictatorship of the capitalists, known as the American Government, again expresses his love for the Russian "people," for he, "maintains unimpaired faith in the Russian people, in their high character and their future."

What Russian "people" is Wilson here referring to? The emigres? The expropriated capitalists, aristocrats and land owners? The Russian bourgeoisie and former exploiters of the Russian peasants and proletariat, represented here by Bakhmeteff.

Certainly not the Russian workers and peasants, against whom Wilson sent an American army in Archangel and Vladivostok to express America's love for them with bayonets, shrapnel, and machine guns. How well Capitalist America loves the Russian Workers' Government is further attested by the support given to Kolchak, Denikine, Yudenitch, and every other reactionary Czarist counter revolutionist who warred upon the Russian Soviets. This wonderful and abiding faith in the high character and future of the Russian people is further manifested by the shipment, by his government, practically gratis, of tons of war material to aid the Polish Imperialists in their attempt to destroy the Russian Workers' Republic, and in the blockade maintained against them, during which hundreds of thousands of these beloved Russian workers, men, women, and children died of hunger and disease. The sentencing in an American court of four young Russian workers to twenty years imprisonment at hard labor for issuing a leaflet calling upon this government to raise the blockade, and the raids and assaults upon the persons and property of Russian citizens who are members of the Communist Party of America which is affiliated with the dominant party in Russia, and their subsequent deportation, are further examples of how the American capitalists love the Russian working class.

The hypocrisy of this discredited politician, Wilson, is so colossal as to be almost farcical "That the present rulers of Russia," he states, "do not rule by the will of any considerable number of the Russian people is an uncontestable fact."

Wonderful Wilsonian logic. If this be true, if the present government of Russia is now supported only by an inconsiderable number of the Russian people, and with this slight support, Soviet Russia has been able to exist in spite of the blockade and six years of continuous warfare, and has succeeded in defeating and humiliating the United Allied Imperialists of the world including America, in all their efforts to destroy this proletarian republic; if in spite of all the deceit, slander, and villification heaped upon them by the whole lying capitalist press of the world they have succeeded in winning the confidence and support of the working class of every country, if it is an uncontestable fact that the present rulers of Russia do not rule by the will of any considerable number of the Russian people—we tremble to think what these Russian peasants and workers will do to you, Mr. Wilson, and to the class and the government you represent, after they shall have gained the adherence of the 150,000,000 people of Russia, to say nothing of the 6,000,000 British trade unionists, and the workers of Poland, France, Italy, Germany, Turkey, India, China, America, etc.

Woodrow Wilson, in his note, expresses his unalterable opposition to the recognition of Soviet Russia, which is utterly repugnant to his moral sense and because of the propaganda carried on against American capitalist institutions and "the cynical repudiation of their obligations," etc. etc.

No, Mr. Wilson, we do not expect you and your class to recognize the government of the workers and peasants of Russia—at least not until the American working class take you and capitalist friends by the nape of the neck and the slack of your stolen breeches and force you to do so—as the British workers have so recently done to your colleague Lloyd George.

Immediately upon the receipt of this remarkable American document, France officially recognized the German Baron Wrangel, operating in the Crimean peninsula, as the head of the new "Alldrussian" government, while the Red Armies of Soviet Russia are closing in on the Polish capital, and a new Workers Soviet Republic is about to be born.

Premier Millerand, spokesman for the French bankers and imperialists, believes that the American note commits this government to the French policy of backing Baron Wrangel and of waging war upon the workers of Soviet Russia. Millerand agrees with Wilson that "the future of civilization is at stake" and says:

"The American and French governments cannot have official relations with a government resolved to conspire against institutions of France, whose diplomats would be instigators of revolt and whose speakers proclaim they will sign contracts with the intention not to live up to them."

And so, while the Bolsheviki are smashing the "cordon sanitaire" freeing the peasants and workers of Poland from the bondage of the Polish and Allied imperialists, they at the same time, and with consumate skill, are splitting the Allies themselves, so that now the pauper nation France, is taken under the munificent wing of Capitalist America, while Imperialist England takes care of bankrupt Italy.

Thus, after two years of peace making and treaty making and war making, this is the end of the League of Nations, that fatherless off spring of the old hag capitalism, a still born corpse, delivered by the mid-wife Wilson, and which is now stinking carrion. And this is the thing which is the issue in the coming presidential elections. Quick, Wilson, another note, and some disinfectant.

While Wilson is spewing forth his venon at the victorious Russian proletariat, and Millerand raving in impotent rage; while Giolleti is playing hide and seek with the Soviets, and Lloyd George is walking the tight rope of British politics, looking for a soft place to land, there met in conference, at London, the representatives of British Labor, who created a "Committee of Action" which was instructed, "To remain in being until it obtained guarantees 1) that British forces would not be used in support of Poland, General Wrangel, or ANY OTHER MILITARY OR NAVAL EFFORT AGAINST SOVIET RUSSIA; 2) of the withdrawal of the British Naval forces blockading Russia; and, 3) the recognition of the Soviet Government and the establishment of unrestricted trading and commercial relations between Great Britain and Russia."

This ultimatum was handed to Lloyd George backed up with the threat of not only a general strike, in case of non-compliance, but the overthrow by British labor of the present capitalist imperialist government of England.

When workers begin to talk like this the beginning of Soviet power and the end of the bourgeois parliamentary regime is in sight.

Robert Smille, of the Miner's Union asks, significally, "If France and General Wrangel cut off Russia's coal supply, will it be interfering too much with France if the British miners cut off France's coal supply?"

Robert Williams, secretary of the Transport Worker's Union, asserted that labor was far more representative of the country than the House of Commons, and Tom Shaw, secretary of the Textile Worker's Union said, "This is the beginning of a movement that will lead to a real league."

The delegates observed the solemnity of the occasion by standing in silence for a full minute, and adjourned after singing "The Red Flag and the "Internationale."

At the same time the International Seamen's Congress, meeting in Brussels adopted a resolution that to prevent future capitalist wars the seamen will refuse to transport troops or munitions, applying this measure to the Polish-Russian conflict.

In Germany, Italy and France the workers have taken similar action. Mass meetings are being held in every industrial center in France protesting against the attack of the French Capitalist Government upon Soviet Russia.

The working class throughout the world are realizing that while Wilson, Lloyd George and Millerand may send "notes" to each other, potential political power is in the hands of the workers. But they must rise, arm themselves and disarm the bourgeoisie; overthrow and destroy the machinery of the bourgeois state and organize workers' councils (Soviets); establish their own government, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which during the transition period from capitalism to Communism will expropriate the capitalist exploiter, and administer industry in their own behalf, thus setting free the elements of the new society with which collapsing capitalism itself is pregnant.

The handwriting is on the wall. The capitalist system is doomed.

Soviet Russia has blazed the way and the working class are challenging the governments, the authority and the power of the ruling class

---

The inevitable process of internal friction and dissolution is already taking place in the United Centrist Party. Less than two months after the so-called unity convention, the State of Washington confirms the rumor that this part of their organization has repudiated the U. C. P. At their State convention they denounced the program and principles adopted at the "unity" convention and have severed all connections with the new party.

It is interesting to note that this state organization of the former C. L. P. was represented by proxy at the convention with the following instructions: "To stand by the principles of International Socialism; to eliminate as much as possible of the foreign words and phrases usually used in our manifestos....; to work for a continuance of the new form in organization; to support the candidacy of Eugene V. Debs for President; to work for the unity of the C. L. P. and the C. P. if could be effected without a surrender of democratic Socialist principles; and, in case unity were effected, retire all those serving as national officials and elect others from the ranks of the united party."

This incident throws another light upon the "unity" convention so ably described by a member of the C. E. C. of the U. C. P. in their Jewish organ refuting Y. E's article on the convention and translated and reprinted elsewhere in this issue.

---

It is reported that the Russian branches of the U. C. P. recently held a convention and decided to organize a Russian Federation despite the decision of their convention.

The German Federaton of the former C. L. P. we understand are also taking steps to secede and organize a new independent Socialist Party.

---

In the future the members of the I. W. W. will have to swallow John Sandgren's venomous attacks against the principles and parties of the Third International in shame and silence. From the columns of their official organ "Solidarity" we reprint the referendum vote for the editorship of the "One Big Union Monthly" which speaks for itself. John Sandgren—742. Billy Waldon—163. L. S. Chumley—186. John Sandgren, theoretician and editor-inchief of the I. W. W. monthly organ is the most rabid anti-Bolshevik, anti-Communist, opportunist and syndicalist within the I. W. W. To judge by the vote there must be many like him.

---

The I. W. W. has long been the prey of its own inherent contradictions—of attempting to reconcile the irreconcilable. In form and structure it is an economic organization; in function and character it is a political organization. As an economic organization it must do all in its power to organize all the workers in each industry and rightly so. As a political organization it must rigdly exclude the backward immature sections of the workers or be swamped by an influx of workers who are interested in nothing but the immediate betterment of conditions in their particular ndustres. Torn between these two conflicting aims the I. W. W. fails economically and politically. On the former, it is being superseded by the One Big Union movement. It has failed to win over the secession unions of the A. F. of L.; it has failed to organize the overwhelming mass of the unorganized workers.

---

Aside from its syndicalist tendencies this conflict of structure and function is the greatest defect of the I. W. W. It cannot be an economc organization and a political party at the same time. It must be one or other. We suggest the reading of the thesis on political parties submitted by the Executive Committee of the Third International to the Second Congress of the Third International recently held in Moscow printed in this issue as shedding more light on this subject.

---

Analysed from this angle the incident of the Philadelphia longshoremen will be clearly understood. The expulsion of this local does not change the situation. As the I. W. W. grows as an economic organization the recurrence of similar "incidents" will rise in proportion. The I. W. W. must throw off its political functions—that is propangadising its anti-Communist ideas and endorse the principles of the Thrd International, and help spread them among its own members as well as to the working class in general. It must accept the Communist Party on the political field and work hand and hand with it for the organization and education of the great masses of the workers to Communism. Otherwise the I. W. W. is doomed to find itself in the camp of the enemies of the working class as the class antagonisms sharpen and the struggle for political power begins to loom on the horizon.

---

The Government has just turned over $600,000,000 to the railroads which represents the subsidy of six per cent. guaranteed by the government when it turned the roads back to its private owner. Add to this the twenty-five to forty per cent. increase in freight and passenger rates which has been computed to represent $1,600,000,000 in round figures and deduct the $600,000,000 wage increase award, and we have a PLUMB PLAN which dikers from Glenn E. Plumb's only as to the proposition in which this huge booty is to be split up. The PLUMB PLAN seeks a fifty-fifty division of the spoils. The workers get a further boost in the High Cost of Living in either case.

---

Lloyd George, Millerand and Wilson will soon throw their arms around the "yellow" Socialists and Laborites to save them from the menace of Bolshevism—and these dirty tools of imperialism will jump at the chance. Henderson, Snowden, Renaudel, Thomas, Gompers, Hillquit & Co. will know now how to improve on Noske, Ebert and Kerensky—they will have learned by the latter's mistakes.

---

THE LEAGUE OF SOVIET REPUBLICS will soon challenge the imperialist LEAGUE OF NATIONS for world supremacy.

# IMPRESSIONS OF THE CONVENTION

**(Translated from the Jewish issue of the "Communist," official organ of the U. C. P.)**

The following article, reprinted from the official Jewish organ of the United Centrist Party in answer to Y. F.'s article "A Convention of Revolutionists," is highly important as shedding more light on the vicious Centrist character and tendences of the leaders of the U. C. P., and the lack ofCommunist understanding among the great majority of the delegates at the so-called "unity convention."

It is no surprise to find that Damon, Caxton, Fisher & Co., ofthe former "minority" of the Communist Party, and the leaders of the C. L. P., Brown, Klein, Dubner & Co., framed a program and constitution which completely evaded the fundamental question — how are the workers to assume power and establish the proletarian dictatorship? The Communist Party had already branded and exposed those leaders as Centrist whose chief object was to split the Communist Party and effect a mechanical amalgamation between the splitting-off faction, the C. L. P. and the "left elements" of the S. P. and force this heterogeneous mixture back to the Left Wingism of 1919.

The reader need merely refer to the statements issued by Damon, Caxton, Fisher & Co. in the recent split to verify the truth of this.

Nor is it surprising to learn that "naturally the authors of this program, Comrades Damon, Caxton and Fisher, were also its chief defenders." This was very evident from the tone of the articles which Damon and Caxton, editor and associate editor respectively of the official national organ of the U. C. P. published in the convention number of their paper.

The following article also explains why these two political adventurers attempted to evade any discussion of fundamental principles and tactics in their paper since the convention. The first issue contained an article "Away with Controversy." The second issue contained an editorial "Shall we argue with Liars?"

Both articles were cowardly attempts to run away from any discussion which would compel them to express their real position on fundamental questions. The first article seemed more like the lamentations of one haunted by unpleasant memories, trying to drive them out of his mind. The second attempted to evade discussion by taking a dishonest advantage of a typographical error which in no way affected the tenor of the argument made by the present writer in criticising the "unity convention" as reported by Damon and Caxton. Had Damon printed what immediately followed the quotation in question, instead of the typographical error itself, he would have immediately exposed his false accusation.

We cite these two instances as further proof of the studied attitude of evasion which the chief theoreticians of the U. C. P. have adopted as their policy, in order to continue humbugging their own membership. It is also interesting to note that Fisher, the former notorious Chicago organizer and lieutenant of Damon in the recent split, also helped to frame and support this Menshevik program. This was the one man whom Damon used to point to with pride as the "greatest Bolshevik of them all." As for the Chicago delegates (most of them former members of the Chicago District Committee who staged the abortive "revolt" in the Communist Party), only two out of the seven could be counted among the left delegates, the other five were on the "right" or vacillating." A more sweeping vindication of the position of the Communist Party before, during and after the split, could not come from the testimony of one who sided against us in the split.

Moreover, the following article, aside from the valuable "close-up" it gives of the Centrist leaders in action and scrambling for jobs, is mainly interesting for the reason that it proves the impossibility of effecting real organic unity between the Communist Party and the U. C. P. in this country so long as the latter organization is dominated and controlled by vicious and unprincipleh centrists of the stripe of Damon, Caxton, Fisher, Meyer & Co. —Editor's note.

---

There appeared in the English issue of the "Communist" an article by Y. F., in which the writer gives his impressions of the convention. These impressions are one-sided, exhibiting everything from one angle only, and therefore we found it necessary to throw light on these occurences, to present all the facts in their true color, even if it is ton certain extent far from pleasant, because we believe that "the bitter truth is far better than the sweet untruth." This is not being done to hamper the work. On the contrary, it is done with the purpose of correcting our errors and to avoid such mistakes as have been committed in the past.

• • •

It seems that God is with the Communists, as the weather was splendid during all the sessions of the convention. From time to time the sky grew cloudy, but it never rained. The place of the convention was very suitable for such an undertaking, and everything was arranged beforehand in the best manner. Delegates were present, representing every part of the United States in spite of all obstacles and the persecution of government agents. We succeeded in holding a convention of a United Communist Party with all the features of a convention, even with caucuses, but without "political machines ..." Nevertheless there operated at times the shadow of "machines." But they could not function evidently out of order.... The assertion of Y. F., that among the names of the delegates are not found any known in 1919, is somewhat exaggerated. Many of the delegates were well known to the membership of our party as valuable workers in the movement.

In reality two conventions met on the first day: a convention of the Communist Party, in which participated 32 delegates, and a convention of the C. L. P., represented by 25 delegates, and one fraternal delegate, all 58 delegates. If to this sum be added the representative of the Third International,—the total reaches 59. The two conventions opened in different places, not far apart. Occasionally a delegate of the C. L. P. would pay us a visit to see whether we were ready for the fusion.

It was already noticeable during the first session that the convention of the Communist Party was not a unified body, but was composed of different elements, who differed not only in tactics, but also in fundamental questions of principle. It was easy to foresee that it will be difficult to present "a solid front" against the C. L. P. This became the more evident, when the program and constitution submitted by the "Unity Committee" were read. This program was prepared by a committee, composed of three members of the C. P. (Damon, Caxton and Fisher) and three of the C. L. P. (Brown, Klein and Dubuer). It was read before both conventions as a basis of unity and it called forth great dissatisfaction among several Eastern delegates and a few Western, because of its (the program's) weakness and of its failure to express a definite revolutionary attitude, especially in regard to mass action.

The parts of the program dealing with mass action did not mention a word about armed insurrection as the only method for the conquest of political power by the working class. It dealt only with the general strike, which is transformed into a general politiral strike. But i did not state the manner, in which political power can be seized.

It is remarkable, that those, who always criticized the old program of the Communist Party, which said so much about mass action without defining it, have copied the very same program, in particular the part about mass action, and thought that they would easily get away with it. Naturally the authors of this program, comrades Damon, Caxton and Fisher, were also its chief defenders. Ford, a New York comrade reads another program, which is more revolutionary and contains a clear definition of mass action. But the trouble was that in other respects it was far from satisfactory. Taken as a whole, it was not a document, but only a weak attempt on the part of a young author, who knew what he wanted, but could not enunciate it on paper in a systematic way. On the other hand the program of the "United Committee" was well written, but lacked "one insignificant detail"—the revolutionary thought. Heated debates began. A few Eastern delegates are speaking in favor of the "New York Program"—that is the program brought in by the New York delegate. They are demanding that this program should be taken as a basis. They are speaking with heat and vigor. Besides the author of the program (N. Y.) also a delegate from Philadelphia, a delegate from Baltimore and another one from New York are defending this program. Comrade Newman takes the floor and criticizes that part of the program ("Unity Committee"), where it speaks about mass action, touches the New York program and speaks about the good and bad sides. He points out that the New York program touches very important questions, which must have a place in our program, as for example, the agrarian question, the "American Legion" as a counter-revolutionary power, the role that the church plays in the struggle against Communism, etc. He proposes that the program of the "United Committee" shall be taken as a basis on the condition that the part of the program dealing with mass action shall be changed in the spirit of the New York program and all other above mentioned points shall be included in this program. At last the authors submit and promise to revise the program. It was late in the evening, when this session ended. Some delegates were still discussing the question of mass action with a few delegates of the C. L. P. convention, who came to our convention to tell us that their convention accepted the program of the "Unity Committee" as a basis. The accumulated energy of the delegates sought an outlet.

The first session of the United Communist Party began with disputes about elections for the various committees. The left element of the convention demanded, that the program should be taken up first, and the elections afterwards. Their motives were as follows:

"That we came to a Communist convention in order to formulate a real Communist program and therefore it is the most important point, which ought to be immediately attended to, as the union through committees is only of secondary importance; that a complete union can not tage place unless we stand on the same ground in regard to principles; that we cannot find a common ground before formulating a program, that the delegates of the C. L. P. are entirely unknown to us and in order to vote intelligently we must discuss the program first if only to get acquainted with the view points of the delegates." These were in general the arguments of the left delegates, who, however, were numerically weak. It is not superfluous to mention that there were in all only five delegates who, discussing the various problems on the floor of the convention, have influenced it towards the left. Among them were two delegates from New York, one from Philadelphia, one from Baltimore and one from Chicago. These five delegates obtained the co-operation of five others, who although participating but little in the debates, have nevertheless helped to move the convention to the left. This is mentioned here in order to throw some light on the subsequent events.

After a prolonged discussion the resolution to proceed with the elections was adopted. The ten delegates refused to vote and began to retire in order to hold a caucus. That had an effect on the convention. Comrade Klein (C. L. P.) moved that the elections be suspended and that a discussion of the program be taken up. The motion passed. And so the "left" delegates celebrated their first victory. The program was read and discussed, every word being carefully weighed. In this manner two hours were consumed in debating about one word, whether capitalism collapsez, because it cannot "produce" the necessities of life or because it cannot provide the necessary means of existence. It seemed as if party distinction disappeared. All trying to exhibit their accomplishments in political economy.

A storm began. The part of the program about "the seizure of state power" was read. This part that should indicate the means and ways through which the proletariat can seize political power, does not even mention a word. It avoids even mentioning the word mass action. It is in general very weak and colorless, endeavoring to dismiss it all with a few phrases about tre class struggle.

The first to speak is Comrade Newman. He points out all defects and that the program is even inferior to the previous program of the C. P. "The other," says he, "at least speaks about mass action, even though it failed to define what mass action is. And we try not even to mention the word. You give us a whole chapter about the conquest of political power and you don't tell us how, through what ways and means it can be accomplished. You avoid the words 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' 'mass action,' and 'armed insurrection.' You must either throw the whole thing out or else talk in clear language."

The convention is thrown into an uproar. Tens of hands are stretched towards the chairman,—all want to speak. Various opinions are expressed. The debate is prolonged until 1 A. M. Against this part of the program speak also the comrades Dellon, Zlank, Ford and Parker of the Communist Party and Comrade Brown of the C. L. P. The comrades Dellon and Zlank speak heatedly. It is evident that for them everything depends on the outcome of the discussion, that it is a case of "to be or not to be," to be a Communist Party or a party of phrases. They demand that this paragraph must speak of dictatorship and an armed insurrection. For this paragraph in its original form speak many delegates.

The most noteworthy speech is made by a comrade of the C. L. P., who says that "the 'left' delegates don't know what they want. They demand that the words 'dictatorship of the proletariat' 'and armed insurrection' shall be openly repeated several times. I am against it. For me the word 'dictatorship' is repulsive. It is only because it is a necessary evil that we include it in our program. Therefore let it remain under the paragraph about dictatorship. But why repeatedly mention it?"

It is noteworthy that the so-called "left" delegation of the Chicago district was not what it pretended to be. Of the seven delegates only two were left. The rest were either of the right, or they vacillated so much that it was a strain on one's eyes merely to watch them. The session is adjourned, leaving dissatisfaction in the hearts of the left delegates. They immediately summoned a caucus of left delegates, to which only those are invited, who are reliable and balanced in question of principle.

They debate the question: what is to be done? They decide not to compromise. Several delegates express the opinion that the "morning is wiser than the evening" and that tomorrow all will be well. The leaders of the Communist Party are smarting under the pain of defeat. They thought that all are already united into one party and they could, therefore, afford to slightly disregard vital principles and here they met with such opposition. They come to us in order to make a compromise. The "left" delegates are disappointed, especially so about the Chicago organizer, Comrade Fisher, who has suddenly as if by some miracle found himself among the "vacillating."

• • •

The morning proved to be wiser than the preceding evening and that was because our "leaders," the authors of the program, became wiser over night. The left delegates passed everything they wanted. The committee brings the paragraph in a revised form. It is designated now "the nature of the state," and the paragraph about mass action speaks explicitly about armed insurrection as the only means for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a great victory for the ten left delegates, who have led the convention towards the right road. It is to them that the Communist movement of America is indebted for the clearly expressed revolutionary program.

An interesting debate occurred about the question of participating in political elections.

(Continued on page 8)

# Economics and Politics During the Period of Transition

By N. LENIN

I had intended to write a short pamphlet on this subject for the second anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Power. Pressure of work has prevented me from getting beyond the preliminary preparation of the material. Therefore I have decided to discuss quite briefly, and in compact form, what I consider to be the most essential points of the subject. The condensed form has many drawbacks, but a short newspaper article may perhaps lend itself to discussion by Communists of all lands.

### I.—The Inevitability of a Transition Period

Theoretically there is no doubt that there must be a transition period between Capitalism and Communism. It is inevitable that this period should have the characteristics of both social orders.

It is inevitable that the transition period should be a period of struggle between the dying Capitalism and the newly-born Communism, or, in other words, between the vanquished, but not destroyed Capitalism, and the newly-born, but as yet weak, Communism.

The inevitability of an entire historic period, bearing these transitional characteristics, must be quite clear not only to Marxists, but to every educated person, more or less acquainted with the theory of development. Nevertheless, all the reasonings and discussions on the transition to Socialism by contemporary representatives of the small-bourgeois democracy show a complete disregard of this obvious truth. In spite of their supposed Socialist label, all the representatives of the Second International, including Macdonald, Jean Longuet, Kautski and Friedrich Adler belong idealogically to the small-bourgeois democracy.

It is characteristic of the small-bourgeois democrats to abhor the slass struggle, to endeavor to devise means to avoid it, and to aim at conciliation and at smoothing and rounding off all sharp angles. For this reason such democrats either refuse to recognize the entire historic transition period from Capitalism to Communism, or consider it their duty to invent plans for the conciliation of both warring forces, instead of assuming the leadership of one of them.

### II.—Russian Peculiarities do not Alter Essential Forms

In Russia the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in some respects from that of the predominant countries, owing to the backwardness and small-burgeois character of our country. But the fundamental forces and forms of national economy are the same in Russia as in every other capitalist country, and therefore certain peculiarities of the Russian struggle do not alter essentials.

These fundamental forms of social economy are Capitalism, small industrial production and Communism. These fundamental forces are: the bourgeoisie, the small-bourgeoisie (especially the peasantry), and the proletariat.

The economy of Russia in the period of proletarian dictatorship represents the first steps of communistically united labor towards pitting united mass production against small private enterprise, and against the still lingering capitalism which is behind it.

### How Far Russian Labor is United

Labor in Russia, to-day, is communistically unified precisely to the extent in which:

(1) Private property for productive purposes has been abolished;

(2) The State is organizing mass production on a nationl scale on State lands and in State enterprises, and is distributing labor power among the various departments of National Economy, and State produce among the workers.

We speak of the "first steps" of Communism in Russia (see our program adopted in March, 1919), in view of the fact that all these conditions have been only partially achieved, or, in other words that the realisation of these conditions is only in its initial stage. What can be achieved at once by a revolutionary act, has been achieved at once; for instance, between the 26th October, 1917, and the 8th November, 1917, all private land ownership was abolished, and the big land-owners were expropriated without compensation. In the course of a few months all the big capitalists, owners of factories, workshops, companies, banks, railways and so on were also expropriated without compensation. State organization of industrial production on a large scale, the transition from workers' control to workers' management of factories, workshops and railways, has, in its main and fundamental lines, already been accomplished.

### Agricultural Organization in its Initial Stages.

In the agricultural domain, on the other hand, the process is as yet in its initial stage. Various forms of small agriculturists' associations have also been formed as a preliminary to an organization on purely Communist lines. This work is also as yet in the initial stage.* The same may be said of the State organization of distribution which is taking the place of the private trader, the State storage and delivery of cereals to the towns, and of manufactured goods to the villages.

### Capitalism Still Flourishes Among the Peasants.

Peasant production and distribution is still conducted as private trade. The capitalist system in that domain is very deep and widespread, and there capitalism is preserved and continually resuscitated in its fierce struggle with Communism.

The struggle manifests itself in:—

(1) Illicit trading, "mestchnitchestvo," as we call it, a name derived from the word "mestrok," a sack or bag.

(2) Speculation directed as an attack upon State storage of cereals and State distribution.

### III.—Communism Gradually Triumphing Over Capitalism.

Let us take concrete examples in order to illustrate these abstract, theoretical formulas. According to the statistics of the "Comprod" (i.e., the Commissariat of Supplies) the State collected and stored from August 1, 1917, to August 1st, 1918; about thirty million poods (a pood is 36 English pounds) of corn. In the following year the State stored about 110,000,000 poods. In the three corresponding months of the year 1919 to 1920, the supplies have reached the figure of 45,000,000 poods, as compared with 37,000,000 poods in the corresponding months in 1918.

These figures show clearly a slow, but steady improvement and a triumph of Communism over Capitalism. This improvement has been obtained in spite of almost insuperable difficulties caused by the civil war, which Russian and foreign capitalists are engineering against the Workers' Republic, using all the resources of the world's mightiest powers.

### The Proletarian Dictatorship Assured.

Therefore, notwithstanding the lies and calumnies of the bourgeoisie of all lands and of their avowed or unavowed helpers, the "Socialists" of the Second International, the fact remains that, as far as the economic problem is concerned, the victory of proletarian dictatorship, of Communism over Capitalism, is assured. The bourgeoisie of the whole world is infuriated against Bolshevism, against which it organizes military attacks and conspiracies, so far as the reconstruction of the Social Order is concerned, fully aware that our victory is inevitable, unless we are crushed by military might. It is certain that the bourgeoisie will not succeed in crushing us.

How far we have already beaten Capitalism is shown in the following table of the Central Statistical Department on the production and consumption of cereals, not in the whole of Soviet Russia, but in 26 of her provinces (gubernii):

PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND CONSUMPTION OF CEREALS IN 26 PROVINCCES.

| Producing Provinces— | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Towns | 4.4 | — | 20.9 | 20.0 | 41.5 | 9.5 |
| Villages | 28.6 | 625.4 | — | — | 481.8 | 16.9 |
| Towns | 5.9 | — | 20.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 6.8 |
| Villages | 13.8 | 114.0 | 12.1 | 27.3 | 151.4 | 11.0 |
| Totals | 62.7 | 739.4 | 53.0 | 68.4 | 741.7 | 18.6 |

1. Population (millions).
2. Production of cereals, not including seeds and forage (million poods).
3. Delivered by the Comprod (million poods).
4. Delivered by illicit traders (million poods).
5. Total quantity of cereals at the disposal of the population (million poods).
6. Consumption of cereals per person (poods).

### State Supplies Half, Illicit Traders Half.

Thus the Comprod (Commissariat of Supply) provides the towns with nearly one half the supplies, and the illicit traders supply the other half. These figures have been arrived at after a minute examination of food conditions of town workers in 1918. It must be borne in mind that corn supplied by the State is ten times cheaper than that supplied by private traders. This statement is based on a thorough examination of workers' budgets.

An earnest consideration of these statistics will provide the investigator with material explaining the fundamental characteristics of present-day Russian economics.

The Russian workers have been liberated at last from the age-long exploitation and opression of landowners and capitalists. This step forward to real freedom and equality, a step born for swiftness and magnitude, unique in the world's history, is ignored by the partisans of capitalism. Amongst these are the small bourgeois democrats who talk of liberty and equality in the sense of bourgeois parliamentary democracy, which they wrongly declare to be democracy in general, or, as Kautsky says, "pure democracy."

The workers who appreciate the importance of real equality and freedom, the freedom from the domination of landowners and capitalists because they have suffered under it, stand firm for the Soviet power.

In a country of peasants those who benefited most and at once by the dictatorship of the proletariat were the peasants in general. Under the rule of the landowners and capitalists the Russian peasant was hungry. Never in the whole course of Russian history has the peasant been able to work for himself. He went hungry while he delivered hundreds of millions poods of corn to the capitalists for our towns and for exports abroad. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the peasant worked for himself for the first time, and fed better than the town dweller. For the first time the peasant beheld real, actual freedom: freedom to eat his own produce, freedom from hunger. It is already known that equality in the division of land has been established on a maximalist basis—in the majority of the cases the peasants divide the land according to the number of persons to be fed.

### SOCIALISM ENTAILS THE ABOLITION OF CLASSES.

In order to abolish social classes one must first overthrow the landowners and capitalists. We have accomplished this part of the task, but that is only a part, and not the most difficult part of our stupendous labor. In order to abolish classes one must, in the second place, abolish the difference between the worker and the peasant, and one must make all the people—workers. This cannot be done in a hurry. It is a much harder task than the first, and will consequently, take much longer to accomplish.

It is a task which cannot be solved by the overthrow of any one class. It can only be solved by a constructive remodelling of the entire social economy, by a transition from an individual, a small, private trading economy, to a social economy on a large scale. Such a transition must necessarily be a lengthy process, and it would only be retarded and hampered by hasty and imprudent administrative and legislative measures. This transition can only be accelerated by helping the peasant to remodel the entire system.

In order to accomplish the second and more difficult task, the proletariat, having conquered the bourgeoisie, must unswervingly pursue the following line of policy with regard to the peasantry: the proletariat must distinguish between the working peasant and the peasant owner, the peasant trader and the peasant speculator. The be-all and end-all of Socialism lies in this distinction.

It is therefore not surprising that those who render lip service to Socialism, but act like smallbourgeois democrats, fail to understand this essential of Socialism.

To arrive at the above mentioned distinction is by no means easy, because in real life, all the characteristics of the "peasant," no matter how various and contradictory they may be, form one big whole. Nevertheless, the distinctions are there. They are the inevitable outcome of the conditions of peasant economy and peasant life. The working peasant has been oppressed for centuries, the speculators and the capitalist states, including the most democratic republics. The working peasant has nurtured within himself hatred and enmity towards these age-long oppressors and exploiters, and these lessons, taught by life itself, compel the peasant to seek an alliance with the workers against the capitalist, the speculator and the trader. At the same time, the entire economic structure which makes the peasant dependent on goods received from outside, tends to turn him (not always, but in the majority cases) into a trader and speculator

The peasant, who in 1918-1919 provided the hungry town workers with 40 million poods of corn at the fixed government price, by handing it over to the state organizations, is a true working peasant and a comrade of the Socialist worker. He is the latter's most reliable ally, and his brother in the fight against the capitalist yoke. On theother hand, the peasant who sold surreptitiously 40 million poods of corn at a price ten times higher than the government price, who took advantage of the needs and the hunger of the town worker, who cheated the state, and increased or created everywhere fraud, robbery and scoundrelly transactions, is a peasant profiteer, an ally of the capitalists, a class enemy of the worker and an exploiter. Only an exploiter of the hungry people can speculate with the surplus corn from state lands with the help of implements produced by the labor of town workers.

### THERE IS NO EQUALITY OF THE HUNGARY AND THE WELL FED

"You are the destroyers of liberty, equality, democraty"—is the cry raised from all sides against us. Our detractors point to the inequality, as between the worker and the peasant, in our constitution, to the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly, to the forcible requisitions of surplus corn. Our answer to these accusations is that no other state in the whole world had done so much for the removal of the real inequalities and of the real lack of freedom which for centuries had been the lot of the working peasant. We do not and will never recognize equality with the peasant speculator. We do not recognize theequality of the exploiter with the exploited, of the hungry with the well-fed and the "freedom" of the former to rob the latter. And we shall deal with those highly-educated people who do not to understand this difference, as if they were White Guards, even if they call themselves Democrats, Socialists, Internationalists, Kautzkys, Tchernovs and Martovs.

(To be continued)

*The number of Soviet Economic Councils and Agricultural Communes in Soviet Russia aggregates [illegible] and 1,961 respectively; there are also 3,[illegible]96 agricultural artels (companies or squads). Our Central Statistical Department is engaged at present on the compilation of exact and complete lists of all Soviet Economic Councils and Communes.

# A Letter from S. J. Rutgers to a Japanese Comrade.

No doubt the Left Wing and direct action will have the future, since only by self-activity can the workers learn to control their own, not only in bringing about a change for power but also to reconstruct society on a new basis, which is the more difficult part of the task. Even if tomorrow the workers got the power through parliamentary means and the capitalists would not have recourse to armed power (which, of course, they would) the workers, by entrusting the reconstruction to their parliamentary representatives and leaders would again fall into a new slavery. Only the self-activity and participation of large groups of workers and poor peasants, with the exclusion of exploiters and close control over "intellectuals" from the old bourgeois and middle-classes can help. This is, of course, a difficult situation since the workers have no education and leadership, and science is a monopoly of bourgeois intellectuals and organizations.

The Russians have shown the way in a marvelous manner, although the lack of response in Western Europe threatens the results and forces them to have recourse to militarism and bureaucracy to a certain extent, in order not to be crushed by outside forces and inside misery.

It was a great disappointment to me to find the workers in the West so much less prepared for real action than in Russia. The strength of the old bourgeois or capitalist civilization is so strong here that conditions are much more difficult. But the worst part is, that the workers themselves have become quite a part of the capitalist world. With their enormous organizations, buildings, treasuries, a strong staff of bureacratic leaders, participation in capitalist institutions, in the league of nations, etc., they become imbued with bourgeois spirit and bourgeois interests. Schools, churches, the press and all that we call civilization tends to confuse them, giving them just enough knowledge to enable the workers and peasants to fall victims of the reasoning of the master class, and not enough to analyse and destroy the illusions. Those workers that develop themselves above the average necessary for the capitalists are largely bribed and corrupted by money, positions or respectability.

Nowadays, in all the countries of the West, the masses are starting from the bottom in direct action and self-activity, but they are betrayed time and again by their leaders and by intellectuals from their own ranks. This process will continue, I fear, for some time and meanwhile western society is running fast towards a complete collapse and chaos, and it will be extremely difficult to rebuild anything from the ruins left. A great deal of misery and cruelty is now awaiting us, although the collapse of capitalism proceeds so rapidly that either a complete slavery or a new life will have to spring up. No doubt it will be new life, since Russia holds out to help us though.

But for some time we still expected that Western Europe, once awakened, would soon take the lead and help Russia to reconstruct its economic life and its new social structure.

Some of us are now inclined to believe that difficulties in the older countries to overcome bourgeois civilization and bourgeois institutions are so great that the less developed countries of the East, including Russia, offer a better chance and may proceed in the new development. Such Communists remember that civilization has in former times also changed its center from East to West and from South to North, and that even in animal development, new species do not develop from those that have adapted themselves most perfectly to their surroundings, but from more primitive species that have more possibilities for adaptation to new circumstances. This, however, is a dangerous analogy to transmit into social life and we should be very careful with such examples. But still there is some fundamental truth in it and it throws more attention to the East. It may be remembered that instinctively the Russians always have paid more attention to the East than our Western friends in general.

Of course, all this should by no means diminish our activities here; on the contrary, the world will have to change all around and strenuous efforts will be required everywhere. But it may emphasize for our Eastern friends their responsibilities, and stimulate their activities. It would be a dangerous mood to expect too much from others, more dangerous, f the possibilities are that a great part of the common task will fall on their own shoulders. I cannot judge whether Japan is already so far overpowered by capitalist organization and spirit, that difficulties there are almost equal to those in Western Europe and that we have to look more to the subjugated races of China and India. But anyhow I feel a greatly increased interest in Far Eastern affairs, especially in the actual facts about the life of the original population.

The Soviet System is very flexible and can be adapted as in Russia, to small and middle peasantry, handicraft, etc. But to know whether and how this could be possible we ought to study those conditions in the light of Russian achievements.

Could you not help us in this respect by your own judgement, and by sending literature, as far as this has has been published in some modern language? I mean conditions of agricultural property (reminiscences of primitive communism or family-property, tenant farmers and proletarians on the land) conditions of workers in small industry, handicraft, etc., traditions of primitive communes or family life etc. Not only about Japan but about China, Korea and Siberia as well. Also from the standpoint of Japanese Socialism it will be highly valuable for you to study more closely conditions in China. A close co-operation will be necessary between Japanese and Chinese revolutionists. Japan seeks domination of China for imperialistic reasons. The foremost duty of the Japanese Socialists therefore, is to count act this policy; in the first place, by opposing militarism and imperialism in every form, by weakening the Japanese capitalist stronghold, by fighting for a human life and material improvements at home, etc.

But the other side of the fight against imperialism is to strengthen the Chinese proletariat, to increase its power of resistance, to help to bring the Chinese movement in the line of class consciousness and Bolsaevism. For that purpose it is necessary to study closely its conditions, its history, its traditions and feelings and to create by your own actions and deeds that feeling of mutual trust, that is necessary for co-operation under such difficult circumstances. Japan and China as nations are in such a direct antagonism, that it may be helpful to have the support of European comrades in clearing up the general situation and mutual misunderstanding. We are becoming more and more aware of the utmost importance of developments in the Far East for the great problem of the world revolution.

# Industrial Unionism and the General Strike

By MORD WILGUS

A comrade from America inquires of me "whether the Triple Alliance is sleeping." Sleeping does not describe the Triple Alliance correctly. I would rather say that it was stillborn. That the Alliance exists can not be doubted, but its existence is that of dead matter, devoid of flesh and blood, and all the other attributes that are characteristic of life and action. The cause of its inactivity is self-evident. The Triple Alliance is composed of three distinct bodies: Miners, Railwaymen, and Transport workers; each of which insists on acting individually on behalf of its own particular interests, without the smallest regard for the interests of the general mass of workers, or even of the other members of the Alliance. The result is that the Central Organization is powerless to act as a single unit, a situation which is as dangerous to Labor as it is deplorable. Moreover, the moving and courageous spirit that is essential to a strong centralized body is foreign to the fake Labor leaders. Mr. Thomas is still galloping after the coat-tails of respectability, and his readiness to accept honors from the parasitic hands of the exploiters is convincing proof of his quite traitorous conduct to the working class. The rewards of Judas Iscariot was microscopic compared with those of J. H. Thomas, the man who would gladly lick the boots of the master-class as a demonstration of his servility. This is the same labor-faker who shed crocodile tears on his visit to the battlefields of France, where he observed the body of the Right Hon. Raymond Asquith lying side by side with that of a humble proletarian soldier. What further proof is necessary to demonstrate the intrinsic identity of the classes?

### The Seattle Strike.

But to return to the topic. Let us pause and see what experience, the ablest of teachers, will tell us on this fundamental problem of Industrial Unionism and the General Strike. I refer now to the general strike in Seattle—a great industrial city on the Pacific coast—during the early part of 1919. The facts are as follows: The shipbuilders had several grievances against their masters, which they were anxious to clear up. The union interviewed the owners, and they categorically refused to consider the demands. The workers' powerful industrial weapon was therefore decided upon to bring the bosses to their senses. A strike was declared. The companies countered with a threat of immediate dismissal of all those men who failed to return to work the following morning, a threat which could easily be enforced, because the signing of the Armistice had diminished the demand for shipping. The situation became critical, and a meeting of the City Labor Council was called to consider the grave danger to organizer labor. After a little hesitation and rambling, a general strike was decided upon, to take effect at once. The craft unions greeted this war-cry with great enthusiasm, and the general strike was complete. The buzz and tumult of a great city was no more. Not a thing was moved- not even the private cars of the masters. Wherever a wagon or an auto was observed, it was immediately silenced by by the pickets. The factories were shut tight, and the city was as quite as a dumb-bell. The only vehicles that budged were those bearing large signs, with the inscription: "By Permission of the Labor Council." Now, everyone is quite aware of the fact that if it comes to a test of endurance, the capitalists are by far the stronger. They do not buy flour, potatoes, coal, vegetables etc. piecemeal; on the contrary, by purchasing these necessities in large quantities, they not only obtain them cheaper, but they have a constant supply on hand, but not so the working class, which lives from hand-to-mouth, day in and day out. The Labor Council therefore found itself face to face with a situation it had never even dreamed of. A firm decision was necessary. The Council either had to feed the workers or surrender. May it be said to the lasting credit of the Council, that its members braved the situation and determined to feed the workers. The Council was likewise obliged to provide food for the sick, keep the streets clean, furnish lights to the hospitals, etc. Furthermore, in order not to let the rowdies run riot, the Council provided pickets (or Red Guards) to patrol the city streets. Hence the functions of government automatically dropped into the hands of the Labor Council. But was this Revolution? Not at all. It was never intended to be such. What actually happened was this: the capitalists, terrified at the power displayed by the workers, called on the military to intervene, and with force in one hand and promises in the other, they were prepared to talk to the workers on their own terms—naturally! This ended the general strike. What I wish to point out is that the subversion of the small crafts into that great ocean of General Labor not only secured the rights of organized labor in particular, but demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that the working class was able to take control of the industries, if they only desired to do so.

### Industrial Unionism Not Enough.

To be sure, industrial unionism is absolutely essential to modern class-warfare, but industrial unionism per se is not the be all and end all of capitalism. Indeed, there are plenty of industrial unions to-day which are highly reactionary. The Miners' Federation of America still tolerates the renegade Lewis as its President, in spite of his open betrayal of the miners in their last strike. Australia has a "One Big Union," yet it is far from being revolutionary. It might even be stigmatized as conservative. Hence all talk of Industrial Unionism as the Saviour of Mankind is pure bunkum and claptrap. Unless the unionism be permeated with a spirit of rebellion, and a conscious desire to overthrow capitalism, its changing from craft to industrial organization is like changing from Tweedledee to Tweedledum.

### Communism and the Limitations of Economic Strikes.

However, it is not at all essential that all the workers be class-conscious. Had the Russian Communists waited until each and every Russian was a Bolshevik, they might have lingered an eternity—and longer still. If there be dissatisfaction and discontent (and no one can deny that this is so to-day), a conscious minority, conscious of its historic mission, can and must swing the masses towards a revolutionary effort to capture and destroy the bourgeois state. It is the very absence of this active, organized minority that causes the impetus of all the great strikes to spend themselves in utter exhaustion and in temporary weakness. This is the reason why the Seattle general strike was a failure, in spite of its apparent success. No greater exhibition of solidarity was ever more complete than that of the workers of Seattle. Yet it failed. The same is true of Winnipeg. A general strike such as Seattle or Winnipeg can easily be turned into a national general strike if the active minority is on the job and well organized in a Communist Party. To recapitulate: Industrial Unionism to-day is made imperative by the development of machinery and the concentration of capital, but this organization in itself is not, and cannot be the "Messiah" of the Revolution. The union organizations, by the very nature of things, are not adapted to revolutionary action. Their fight being always a struggle to better conditions, they are not able to distinguish between the immediate illusory gain and the complete emancipation of their class. It is therefore important that we realize the natural limitations of purely economic strikes.

In order to make the essential point, that industrial unionism does not spell Revolution, let us assume that the Triple Alliance is a unified body or One Big Union. True, such an organization would bring us a step nearer to Communism, but Industrial Unionism in itself is not the Social Revolution. It is simply a more scientific reorganization of organized labor, for the purpose of repulsing the onslaughts of the centralized capitalist class, which is able by means of the trustification of industry to pit one section of the workers against the other. This method of combination by industry instead of craft is not the result of abstract philosophical reasoning, but is forced upon the workers as the only suitable weapon for defense. The proof of this lies in the fact that Industrial Unionism never precedes the trustification of industry, but, on the contrary, is the legitimate and inevitable off-spring of Big Business. In short, neither Industrial Unionism or the General Strike (to wit, the late Irish General Strike to free the hunger strikers), means Social Revolution. The latter undoubtedly must precede and then run concomittant with an uprising, but the successful "engineering" of this general strike is the task of the Communist Party.

### When the Revolution Will Come.

To obtain Economic Emancipation, it is necessary to fight for it. To wait, as some evolutionary encyclopedic pedagogues advise us so very often, until all the workers are organized into Industrial Unions, and then to wait another century until capitalism crumbles by its own weight, is sheer nonsense and hypocrisy. That capitalism contains the seed of its own destruction is evident, but we must remem-

(Continued on page 7)

# A Reply to Bertrand Russell

Bertrand Russell's impressions of Soviet Russia have been given the widest publicity in the capitalist press, and in the liberal periodicals, including the N. Y. Call. These articles make no contribution to the knowledge of the Soviets, already made available through the investigations of such trained observers as, Ransome, Bullitt, Price, Meltride, and others, and are valuable only insofar as they show the effect of a proletarian revolution upon the mind of the bourgeois pacifist and radical.

Russell became famous during the war for his opposition to the capitalist-imperialist governments, rightly attributing the cause of all modern warfare between capitalist nations to the need for world markets and for the exploitation of the peoples and resources of less developed countries in the interests of the capitalist class of the nations involved, and because of this and the articles contributed since the war, led many to believe that Russell was convinced that war with all its horrors could only be permanently avoided by the forcible dispossession of the capitalist class and the introduction of Communist society.

"I went to Russia," says Russell, "believing myself a Communist; but contact with those who have no doubts has intensified a thousand fold my own doubts, not only of Communism, but of every creed so firmly held that for its sake men are willing to inflict widespread misery."

Russell might well have spared himself the trouble of his month spent in Russia—a mere reading of the literature of Communism should have convinced him that he never was a Communist.

Russell cannot think in terms of the working class. A bourgeois sentimentalist and reformer, he himself has lived soft and easily upon the unpaid labor of the workers, having no contact with them or their problems. Steeped in bourgeois ideology, he has no conception of the class struggle, of the clash of irreconcilable class interests, culminating in civil war, the armed uprising of the workers and the seizure of power in the consciousness and fulfilment of their historic mission.

"It is difficult," says Russell, "to exaggerate the difference between a Russian and an Englishman. I am convinced that there is far more resemblance between Mr. Smillie and Mr. Winston Churchill, than between the former and Lenin or the latter and Kolchak."

Here is an attempt, common to all bourgeois ideologists, to make one believe that there is a fundamental difference between the peoples of one nation and others, and that the Bolshevist Revolution is peculiar to Russia and could not possibly take place in England or America, with similar results. We venture to assert that Russell would feel as uncomfortable in the company of the English Communist McLean as he did in the company of Lenin, and as much out of place in a meeting of Welsh miners or the ship workers of the Clyde as in any meeting of Russian workers in Russia.

One of the conditions upon which Russell was allowed to enter Russia was that he travel with the British labor delegation, in whose company he made the journey, a condition that Russell says he was glad to comply with and which the labor delegation allowed him to fulfil. The five members of the British Labor Delegation were not Communists and observed the same phenomena in Russia that Russia did. Also they are real Englishmen, as their names would indicate. The London Daily Herald of July 1st published interviews with the members of this delegation, from which we quote, and it must be remembered that these British trade unionists are not apt to be over-enthusiastic.

A. A. Purcell:

"The action of the capitalist governments and their complicity in attempts to crush organized working class Russia had been amply proved. The Russian Soviet Republic, to be fully understood, should be measured by the fact that its accomplishments had been performed in the face of six years' continuous war, always on its soil, and within its borders, by masses of conspirators backed by foreign finance. Add to that, long sustained attacks and distortions of the foreign press, and one might get a glimpse of the wonderful achievements of the Russian Communist and trade union movement." "On the way home," he added, "we have read the lying statements in the capitalist press regarding the Polish war. After repeating the story of Russian victory, which the press made a Russian reverse, he said, they had actually seen Polish prisoners pass a resolution in the presence of the delegation, giving their opinion of the war and their leaders, afterwards attaching their signatures." "This we have in our possession." "In conclusion," said Purcell, "All power to the Soviet Republic is what I sold in Russia, and here in England I say All power to the Soviets everywhere. Up with the dictatorship of the proletariat."

R. C. Wallhead:

"The opening of the Volga will certainly hasten economic reconstruction, and already the flow of oil from Baku is materially altering the situation. The poor peasants are infinitely better off than ever they have ben before. The men responsible for the reconstruction are optimistic, and with reason. Their work in hand will alter the whole situation for the better."

Robert Williams:

"What I have seen in Russia surpasses my most hopeful expectations. The greatest experiment ever made in progressive development of human institutions has taken place under the most adverse circumstances. Those working for the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth deserve not only words of encouragement, but deeds, in their support. British labor is used to sympathetic striking in aid of men striving for trifling improvement in conditions, but the Russian revolutionists strike in the most effective way, for all the wealth for the workers who aid in the production of that wealth.

"Sympathetic action is due to them because they are in the van of the proletarian revolutionary movement, and every advantage they can obtain, every reform they can achieve, will affect the workers in other countries."

These are the impressions made upon the minds of men, who, although they are not Communists, are by their own proletarian experiences, moved to the expression of international solidarity of all the workers of the world, and who have observed the workings of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, not as Englishmen, but as workers.

Russell stresses the fact that by dictatorship the Russian Communist actually means the rule of the class conscious proletariat, the ruthless crushing of the counter revolution, the forcible expropriation of the capitalist owners, the iron discipline of the revolution,—something that his bourgeois pacifist mind cannot tolerate especially when practiced by the workingmen.

"Opposition is crushed with out mercy," says Russell, "and since all evils are due to private property, the evils of the Bolshevist regime, while it has to fight private property will automatically cease as soon as it has succeeded. These views are the familiar consequences of fanatical belief. To an English mind they reinforce the conviction upon which English life has been based ever since 1688, that kindliness and tolerance are worth all the creeds in the world—a view, which, it is true, we do not apply to other nations or to subject races."

Kindliness and tolerance by the capitalist dictatorship, in England, indeed. Let Russell consider the ruthless suppression of the workers during the Chartist movement—the East End of London, the cotton mills of Manchester, will bear eloquent testimony to the kind and tolerant treatment of the children, the women and the men of England at the hands of her capitalist class.

No working class in the world has been so mercilessly exploited and sacrificed as have the workers of England in the attempt of the British imperialists to make England "the workshop of the world."

Perhaps Russell missed in Russia, the pleasant English country-side and the comfortable houses of the smug and complacent British bourgeoisie, whose guest he has so often been—and that other British institution—the poor house.

But Russell is appalled when he contemplates the prospect of civil war, of world revolution. In this he sees an universal cataclysm in which civilization might go under for a thousand years.

Russell completely ignores the fact that the capitalist system is collapsing, is breaking up and falling to pieces about his ears, that as a result of this system and the world wars it breeds, whole populations are dying of famine and disease in the midst of fabulous wealth, that capitalist imperialist governments only function to enslave the greater part of mankind and will if they endure attempt to drown in their own blood the workers who seek to achieve their emancipation and with it the freedom of the human race.

As an alternative to world revolution, to the seizure of political power by the class conscious workers and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, leading to the introduction of Communist society,—what do the Russells propose?

PEACEFUL EVOLUTION.

The world is standing at the cross roads of history and civilization is indeed in the balance.

"What is the Commune, that sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind?" asks Marx. "The proletarians of Paris," said the Central Committee in its manifesto of 18th March, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs.... They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies by seizing upon the governmental power." "But," says Marx, "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes."

This lesson the Russian Communists learned. They have built up their own political machinery—the proletarian dictatorship, so obnoxious to the bourgeois Russells.*

Marx thus describes the capitalist state:

"During the subsequent regimes, the government placed under parliamentary control—that is, under the direct control of the propertied classes—became not only a hotbed of huge national debts and crushing taxes; with its irresistible allurements of place, pelf, and patronage, it became not only the bone of contention between the rival factions and adventures of the ruling classes, but its political character changed simultaneously with the changes in society. At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class antagonism between capital and labor, the state power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labor, of public force organized for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism. After every revolution marking a progressive phase of the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the state power stands out in bolder and bolder relief."

"Imperialism is, at the same time, the most prostitute and the ultimate form of the state power which ancient middle-class society had commenced to elaborate as a means of its own emancipation from feudalism, and which full-grown bourgeois society had finally transformed into a means for the enslavement of labor by capital." (Civil War in France.)

Here is a perfect picture of that bourgeois state, which our bourgeois pacifists fondly imagine will peacefully evolve into a co-operative commonwealth, but which the working class is coming more and more to realize must be destroyed, root and branch.

Russell fears that in the revolution which will destroy this capitalist state machinery, that, "the heritage of civilization is likely to be lost while hatred, suspicion, and cruelty become normal in the relations of human beings."

One would thing to read this, that in England and America today, we are living in a perfect heaven of fraternal bliss, and that love, confidence, and kindness are the normal relations between capital and labor and with each other. Here again, Marx, with almost prophetic vision castigates the Russells of our time.

"It is a strange fact. In spite of all the tall talk and all the immense literature, for the last sixty years, about the Emancipation of Labor, no sooner do the workingmen anywhere take the subject into their own hands with a will, than uprises at once all the apologetic phraseology of the mouthpieces of present society with its two poles of capital and wage slavery (the landlord is now but the sleeping partner of the capitalist) as if capitalist society was still in its purest state of virgin innocence, with its antagonism still undeveloped, with its delusions still unexploded, with its prostitute realities not yet laid bare...."

"Why those members of the ruling class who are intelligent enough to perceive the impossibility of continuing the present system—and they are many—have become the full mouthed and obtrusive apostles of co-operative production. If co-operative production is not to remain a delusion and a snare; if it is to supercede the capitalist system; if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of capitalist production—what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism—'impossible' communism?"

Russell visited Maxim Gorky and found him dying, and expresses the opinion that the artistic and intellectual life in Russia is dying too. Just how much of the intellectual and artstic life is vouch safed to the workers in England and other capitalistic countries is too well known to need extended comment; the artists and intelligentsia under capitalism are not free but like the workers are the hired men of the ruling class.

In the Bullitt report we find it stated, "The achievments of the Department of Education have been very great. Thousands of new schools have been opened." And the Ransome report states that whereas under the Czar's regime there were six universities there are now sixteen, with a constantly increasing attendance. Tuition is free, and working men and women are urged to attend. The number of libraries has more than doubled. The number of schols has vastly increased. Art galleries and the opera are open to the poorest workers at prices that they can pay.

It appears that out of a mass of contradictions (for example, where Russell says in one place that, "The Russian Government is not imperialistic in spirit, and would prefer peace to conquest," and in another, "The reconquest of Asiatic Russia has revived what is essentially an imperialist way of thinking....") that the one thought to which Russell holds fast is his abnormal fear and obsession, common to all bourgeois pacifists and "yellow" Socialists, that the centralization of power in the hands of the class conscious proletariat, and the world revolution which impends and which the Third International is preparing for, will start a conflagration, beside which the World War will be only a skirmish.

Let it be understood that revolutions are not made with rosewater. Nothing was ever achieved by an oppressed and slave class without a struggle. The every day struggle of the workers to maintain a "living" wage has at times developed into bitter and bloody conflicts entailing untold suffering and hardship upon the workers and their families, and these are mere skirmishes in the class war. Communists do not shrink from their stern duty. The revolutionary war for emancipation from wage slavery will not be won without some casualties among the bravest and the best, but the bloodshed and the slaughter of the workers in the imperialist wars waged by capitalism far exceed the sacrifice imposed upon the workers

(Continued on page 7)

*See Thesis of the Executive Committe of the Communist International published in this issue.

in this their final battle for freedom. And the degree of suffering will depend upon the preparation and organization of the workers in each country. If the workers heed the lessons of the Russian Revolution, if communist propaganda reaches them, and the road to power made plain, the overthrow of the capitalist dictatorship will be less sanguinary. But if the workers follow false teachers of the Russell type and the "yellow" Socialist, the blood brothers of the Russells, with their siren song of peace, peace, when there can be no peace, then indeed, led into a blind alley of social reform, the way out may be bloody beyond compare.

"The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready made Utopias to introduce, par decret du peuple. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending, by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it, the working class can afford to smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen with the pen and ink horn, and at the didactic patronage of the well wishing bourgeois doctrinaire, pouring forth their ignorant platitudes and sectarian crotchets in the oracular tone of scientific infallibility." (The Civil War in France.—Karl Marx.)

Thus Marx disposed of the bourgeois and "yellow" socialist critics of the commune fifty years ago. Thus these owls of our generation, blinking in the sunlight of the workers dawn, will never know, can never understand.

## THESIS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Continued from page 1)

munist Labor Party of Germany") declare that "the party, too, must adapt itself more and more to the idea of the Soviets and to adopt a proletarian character—"Wird gefordert dass auch die Partei sich immer mehr dem Sategedanken anpasst und proletarischen Charakter annimmt" ("Kommunistische Arbeiterzeitung). This is a misleading statement of the idea that the Communist Party, forsooth, must melt into the Soviets, that the Soviets, can, somehow, take the place of the Communist Party.

This idea is fundamenally incorrect and reactionary.

In the history of the Russian Revolution, we witnessed a whole epoch when the Soviets opposed the proletarian party and supported the policy of the agents of the bourgeoisie. The same was witnessed in Germany. The same is possible in other countries also.

On the contrary, in order that the Soviets may carry out their historical mission, the existence is required of such a strong Communist Party that it will not merely "adapt itself" to the Soviets, but will be able to exercise a decisive influence on their policy to force them of their own accord to reject "adaptation" to the capitalist class and the White Social Democracy, and, through the medium of the Communist groups in the Soviets, to lead the latter in the path laid down by the Party.

Those who propose that the Communist Part should "adapt" itself to the Soviets, those who see in such an adaptation a strengthening of the "proletarian character" of the Party—such persons are conferring a very doubtful favor upon both the Party and the Soviets, and are ignorant both of the meaning of the Party and of the meaning of the Soviets. The "Soviet idea" will be victorious the more quickly, the stronger are the Communist parties which we are able to create in every country. The "Soviet idea" is now recognized in words by many "independent" Socialists and even by Right Socialists. We shall only be able to prevent these elements from distorting the Soviet idea if have a strong Communist Party, capable of defining the policy of the Soviets, and of leading them in its train.

(9) The Communist Party is required by the working class not only before the conquest of power, and not only during the conquest of power into the hands of the working class. The history of the Russian Communist Party, which for three years has been in power in a gigantic country, shows that the part played by the Communist Party after the conquest of power by the working class has not only not been diminished, but, on the contrary, has had a colossal development.

(10) On the morrow of the conquest of power by the proletariat, its party nevertheless remains, as before, only a section of the working class. But it is precisely that section of the working class which organized victory. The Communist Party during twenty years, as we saw in Russia—during thirteen years, as we see in Germany—in its struggle not only with the capitalist class but with those "Socialists" who were the instruments of bourgeois influence on the workers, attracted into its ranks the most steadfast, the most far-sighted, the most advanced fighters of the working class. Only in the presence of such a strongly knitted organization of the best section of the working class is it possible to overcome all those difficulties which arise before the working class dictatorship on the morrow of victory. The organization of a new proletarian Red Army, the practical annihilation of the bourgeois state apparatus and the creation in its place of the beginnings of a new proletarian state apparatus, the struggle against the sectional strivings of individual groups of workers, the struggle against local and regional "patriotism," the beating out of paths towards a new labor discipline in all those spheres a decisive voice belongs to the Communist Party, the members of which, by their living example, lead in their train the majority of the working class.

(11) The necessity of a political part of the proletariat disappears only with the complete abolition of classes. On the road to this final victory of Communism, it is possible that the relative importance of the three fundamental proletarian organizations of to-day (the Party, the Soviets, and the Producers' Unions) will be altered, and that gradually one single type of labor organization will be crystallized out. But the Communist Party will be amalgamated entirely with the working class only when Communism cease to be an aim of the struggle and the whole working class becomes Communist.

(12) The second Congress of the Communist International must not only affirm the historical mission of the Communist Party generally, but must point out to the international proletariat, if only in the most general terms, what kind of a Communist Party is required.

(13) The Communist International considers that, especially in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communist Party must be built up on the foundation of an iron proletarian centralism. In order successfully to guide the working class in the long and obstinate civil struggle that is upon us, the Communist Party itself must create within its ranks an iron military discipline. The experience of the Russian Communist Party, which has for three years successfully guided the civil war of the working class, has shown that in this sphere without the strictest discipline, the most perfect centralization, and the most complete comradely confidence of all the Party organizations in the guiding party centre, the victory of the workers is impossible.

(14) The Communist Party must be built up on the foundation of democratic centralism. The chief principles of democratic centralism are: the elective character of the lower groups, the absolutely binding character of all the directions of a higher body for the subordinate groups, and the existence of a powerful party centre of unquestionable authority for all the leaders of party life from Congress to Congress.

(15) A whole series of Communist Parties in Europe and America, in view of the state of siege introduced by the capitalist class against the Communists, are forced to carry on an illegal existence. It is essential to remember that in such a state of things it is occasionally necessary to abandon the strict application of the principle of election, and to allow the directing organs of the party the right of co-optation, as was the case in Russia at one time. In a defacto state of siege the Communist Party will not only be unable to have recourse on every serious question to a democratic referendum amongst all the members of the party (the proposal of a section of the American Communists), but, on the contrary, must empower its executive centre to be able, if necessity requires to take, at short notice, decisions which are important for all members of the party.

(16) The preaching of wide "autonomy" for separate local organizations of the party at the present moment only weakens the ranks of the Communist Party, undermines its capacity for work, and assists the petty bourgeois, anarchical, centrifugal elements.

(17) In the Countries where the bourgeoisie or the counter revolutionary social democracy, is still in power, the Communist Parties must learn accurately to co-ordinate their legal work with their illegal, and, with this, the legal work must always remain under the de facto control of the illegal party. The parliamentary groups of Communists, both in the central and in the local government institutions, must be absolutely and entirely subordinate to the Communist Party as a whole independently of whether the party as a whole at the given moment is a legal or an illegal organization. Those deputies who, in one way or another, do not obey the orders of the party, must be expelled from the ranks of the Communists.

(To be concluded.)

## ECONOMICS AND POLITICS DURING THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION.

(Continued from page 4)

### PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP WILL END SOCIAL CLASSES.

Socialism is the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done its utmost to bring about this abolition. But it is impossible to do away with the class system all at once. Thus the classes have remained and will remain, all through the period of proletarian dictatorship. When classes have finally disappeared, there will be no need for dictatorship, but they will never disappear without the dictatorship of the working class.

The classes have remained, but each one of them has taken a different aspect during this period of proletarian dictatorship; a change has also taken place in their mutual relations. The class struggle does not disappear under proletarian dictatorship, it only takes a different form.

Under capitalism the proletariat has always been the oppressed class—the class which was denied ownership of the means of production, which alone was directly and completely opposed to the bourgeoisie. Therefore it was the only class capable of remaining revolutionary right through the struggle. Having overthrown the bourgeoisie, and having conquered political power, the proletariat has become the governing class. The State Power is in its hands; it controls the socialized means of production, it guides the vacillating intermediate elements and classes, it crushes the power of resistance of the exploiters. All these are special tasks of the class struggle, tasks which, formerly, the proletariat did not and could not undertake.

### THE EXPLOITERS ARE OVERTHROWN BUT NOT DESTROYED.

The class of exploiters, landowners and capitalists has not disappeared, and could not disappear at once under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The exploiters are overthrown, but not destroyed. They retain the basis of international capitalism, of which they are part and parcel. They still possess some means of production, as well as money and extensive social connection. Their power of resistance has increased a hundred, nay, a thousandfold by the very fact of their defeat. Their ability in State, military, and economic administration, affords them a great superiority, so that their importance is considerably out of proportion to their numerical strength, as compared with the whole population.

The class struggle of the overthrown exploiters abainst the victorious vanguard of the exploited, the proletariat, has become more intense. This is only a natural development of the revolution which the "heroes" of the Second International are vainly endeavoring to deny, by substituting reformist illusions for the hard facts of revolution.

Finally, the peasantry, and the entire small bourgeoisie are occupying, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, a medium, or interim, position. On the one hand, they represent a considerable and in backward Russia, an enormous) mass of workers, united by the desire, common to all workers to free themselves from the domination of landowners and capitalists. On the other hand, they consist of small proprietors and traders in towns and villages. Such an economic situation must inevitably produce indecision and wavervings in the relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. As the struggle of the bourgeoisie becomes intensified, all social relations undergo a great radical change, the ingrained conservatism of the peasants and small bourgeoisie is bound to lead to indecision and to sudden and sporadic changes in the adherence of these elements to either one side or the other.

The proletariat must endeavor to influence and guide these vacillating social elements, steadying and spurring on the waverers and backsliders.

We have only to take into consideration all the fundamental forces or classes and the change brought about in their mutual relations by the proletarian dictatorship, in order to realize how infinitely absurd, nay, stupid, is the small bourgeois theory (so prevalent in the Second International) that Socialism will be attained trough "democracy in general." This collosal error is based on the belief in the classless character of democracy, a belief instilled by the bourgeoisie. In reality, democracy itself enters on a new phase under proletarian dictatorship, and the class struggle is lifted into a higher plane, superseding all and every other form of contest.

Generalities about liberty, equality, democracy are nothing but a blind replica of notions borrowed from conditions and relations in industrial production. The endeavor to solve by means of these phrases the concrete tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat is tantamount to adopting, all along the line, the theories and principles of the bourgeoisie. From the proletarian point of view, the only important questions are:

**"Freedom from oppression by which class?"**

**"Equality between what classes?"**

**"Democracy on the basis of private property, or on the basis of the struggle for the elimination of private property?"**

From "Workers Dreadnaught"

## INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM AND THE GENERAL STRIKE

(Continued from page 5)

for that the fruit growing out of this seed is nothing less than the propertyless proletarian masses. When the gap between those who have and those who have not is widened to such an extent that it becomes unbridgable, then, and then only, is the Revolution sealed. No body of men will starve to death without making a desperate effort to get the food from those who have it, but this is not sufficient. We demand the complete annihilation of Wage Slavery.

The Social Revolution can be successfully retarded by a Triple Alliance that has fallen into the claws of lethargy and vituperation; and is both lazy and impotent to take any action. A Triple Alliance of one solid organization acting constantly as a single unit will undoubtedly accelerate the "Day of Judgment." In all events, the complete extinction of the capitalist class can only be accomplished by a Communist Party that declares that to be its sole aim and effort. That is clearly the aim of the Third International and all its affiliated organizations. Therefore all hails for a strong Communist Party of Great Britain. Around such a party the advanced class-conscious guard of the working class will and must rally in order to assure the triumph of world-wide Communism.

From the Workers Dreadnaught.

# Impressions of the Convention

(Continued from page 3)

The program speaks about participating in elections for legislative bodies only, such as Congress, City Councils and State Legislatives. Here appeared conflicting opinions. Several delegates took a stand condemning parliamentary action altogether. Brown of the C. L. P. argued against participation in parliamentary actions. He was supported by several from the Communist Party. Other delegates demanded that the elections shall not be limited for legislature bodies only, but shall include executive offices as well, such as President, Governor, and Mayor. Both sides attempted to prove their points of view.

The opponents of executive elections argued that the election of Communists as Governor, Mayor, and Sheriff will corrupt them and will be detrimental to the movement; that we have no right to take upon ourselves the responsibility for the bourgeois state; that a Communist as a mayor would have to carry out the orders of the City Council, in which will be the representatives of capitalist parties; that he will either have to disregard his Communism or else for even one day; that our participation in election is only for propaganda purposes and he will have no opportunity to keep his job that were our representatives even to enter Congress it would be only for purposes of obstruction, in order to destroy the parliament as their slogan there would be: "Down with parliaments. Long live the Soviets and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." These were the arguments of those who opposed executive elections. The defenders of executive elections, Raphailoff (C. L. P.) and Caxton (C. P.) were not left behind in argumennts. It was understood by both sides that we would not participate in elections this year. And as everything must come to an end so these debates were also ended. Not because the delegates grew tired of it, no, they could have argued ad infinitum, but some wise fellow made a motion to put the question to a vote and it passed. We felt relieved. And, when the vote was taken, the anti-parliamentarians and supporters of executive elections were defeated.

The question of Industrial Unionism called forth a great deal of dissention. This was a question that divided even the "left wing" of the convention, which was its directing influence in matters of principle. The left delegates from the East were firmly opposed to any relations with the I. W. W. Their argument was that we can co-ordinate our activity only with such organizations, which recognize the dictatorship of the proletariat, mass action, and stand on the same ground of principles as ourselves. The Chicago left delegation favored co-ordinating our activity with that of the I. W. W. These differences, however, pertained not to matters of principle, but only tactics. It was a very long debate. Two thirds of the delegates were of the opinion that we can enter into relations with the I. W. W., because it is the only movement of American workers, which is of a potentially revolutionary character. Comrade Dowson expressed his opinion very forcefully. He argued that the A. F. L. must be considered from the stand point of the local unions and not as the official Gompers organization; that he I. W. W. is not the only organization which advocates Industrial Unionism; that what we need is the creation of a new General Industrial Union, which would also include all the other in "One Big Union." After long debates this was also terminated. The original form was adopted with a few improvements. "A stronger I. W. W. must be created etc." was stricken out. Further, the part reading "A Communist, who belongs to the A. F. L., because of the absolute necessity of a job shall utilize every opportunity to express his opposition to this organization, not to reform it, but to destroy it." Here he words were stricken out "because of the absolute necessity of a job."

The question of a name for the party called forth a brief debate. The delegates of the C. P. decided at their first session to insist on the original name of their party. They carried out this decision and voted for the name "Communist Party." On the other hand the delegates of the C. L. P. demanded that the new party shall be known as "The United Communist Party." The vote resulted in 30 for the Communist Party. Uproar followed. Comrade Flynn speaks heatedly. He threatens not to work in the organization of branches. He does not want to work for the "majority" of the former C. P.; he does not want to be responsible for their doings, their literature and pamphlets. He asks how it would be possible to tell the difference between a paper of the "majority" and our paper. It must be admitted that arguments were sound and—after a second vote it was decided to name the new party "The United Communist Party." A small "surprise" was sprung at this unity convention. While the C. L. P. opposed Federations last year and the C. P. favored them, at this convention the reverse was the case—the C. P. against Federations and the C. L. P. for them. The reason of such a change lies in the fact that several branches, which were expelled from the C. P. and joined the C. L. P. carried there the spirit of the Federations. As fiery defenders of the Federations stepped forward a few delegates from Russian Branches, who were expelled from the Russian Federation and who were eager to show what they could do in such organizations. Two plans of organization were presented because the "Unity Committee" could not agree on one plan. And we, therefore, had two currents. Our current was for modified Federations and it was supported by the delegates Raphailoff and Dubuer (C. L. P.); a second current was for a complete abolition of Federations as a hindrance to a properly centralized party, and it was strongly defended by the delegates Newman, Delion, Zlank, Ford and Damon. The result is already known to our comrades—the Federations were abolished.

Were it not the election of party officials, the convention would have remained in the memory of many delegates, especially those of the "left" as a model convention, without any binding caucuses, only the usual, and without machines. But that would be expecting too much. Well, when it came to the "jobs" there started caucuses, big and small. The caucuses of the C. P. delegates were not binding.

As the C. E. C. had to exist of nine members, the "leaders" of the C. P. expected to elect five of their number and four would represent the C. L. P. Five delegates for the C. E. C. were nominated, but during the nomination of alternates there arose a dispute. Comrade Newman asked wherein consisted the difference between electing five from the C. P. or five from the C. L. P. He asked, "Why should we be so interested in electing five delegates instead of four? What will it matter, who has one member more, we or the former C. L. P.? We are now one party Are there then differences and divisions left according to parties? When we left delegates began our struggle about the question of mass action, we have found supporters among the C. L. P. On the other hand there stood members of the C. P. in opposition to us. In many other questions the same thing happened."

"The left elements of the C. P. and of the C. L. P. have joined forces. Why should we be interested in electing a comrade who does not agree with us on fundamental questions of principle? The left comrades of the C. L. P. are a great deal nearer to us than some of our own delegates. We have not now two parties, but only one."

The last words strongly appealed to comrade Damon's emotions and he vigorously applauded. He also expressed the thought that it is one party and advised the comrades to use their own judgment when voting.

The delegates of the C. L. P. were also caucusing a great deal. They also decided to nominate five delegates. And when the election took place, the result indicated that the caucus of the C. P. was no caucus at all—five of the C. L. P. and four of the C. P. were elected. Comrade Brown of the C. L. P. was elected as International Secretary with 30 votes as against Caxton with 23. The defeat was due to the fact that one of the C. P. nominees was not a fit person, and as several nominees of the C. L. P. appeared to be better fit for the office, they succeeded in swinging some C. P. delegates.

Damon immediately resigned and after him Scott and Reinhart. It must be noted here that the delegates of he C. L. P. behaved with tact and honesty. On the contrary, several delegates of the C. P. talked about a split. And all on account of the jobsas no questions of principle were involved.. The delegates separated. Once more separate caucuses. The "leaders" seemed to prefer to split the movement rather than to allow such a C. E. C. The delegates of the C. L. P. were very obstinate. They argued that it was not their fault that delegates of the C. P. have voted for them. It was up to the left delegates to show once more that he movement was dear to them and that they will not permit a split after so much wasted time and energy. They were disappointed with the leaders of the party, with their conduct. They were indignant about Damon, who used his position to force his demands on the convention. The party is dearer to them than such trifles and they moved that the C. P. caucus be binding. Nominations were resumed. The evening passed and the morning following. A C. E. C. of ten members is now under consideration. The delegates of the C. L. P. are still caucusing. A group of delegates from the C. P. went over to the caucus of the C. L. P. singing the International. That was effective. The other went to meet them. They greeted each other warmely and in this manner a split was avoided. The elections went off quickly. As International Secretary was Caxton elected instead of Brown. Damon and Myer remain International Delegates; Scott is an alternate for Damon and Berry for Myer. The C. E. C. consists of Damon, Scott, Reinhart, Delion, Caxton; Brown, Dowson, Klein, Flynn, and Myer. The alternates are Zamlin (C. P.), Dubner (C. L. P.), Stone (C. P.), Jones (C. L. P.), Kerger (C. P.), Hill (C. L. P.), Ford (C. P.), (Molkalb (C. L. P.), Kazbock (C. P.), Layon (C. L. P.).

And so everything is well that ends well. Nevertheless, it is difficult to forget the only stain on the unity convention. Perhaps, we shall forget in the future, if our leaders will mend their ways and will be willing to repress their individual whims. And still we had one of the finest conventions that ever took place. The convention as a whole was enthusiastic, a whole world of enthusiasm, a whole world of selfsacrifice and idealism.

I sit in the train. Opposite to me sits an American delegate. I recollect how he attacked the left delegates on the question of mass action. I asked him, what he thinks in general about the gathering. "We have a model of a program. We need not be ashamed of our program. A real definitely revolutionary program," says he. I see in these words the influence of our delegates on the American comrades. I see that the latter are gradually developing a truly revolutionary spirit.

And all this during a period of one week! It is to be regretted that we could not stay together a little longer....

---

## CASH STATEMENT FOR JULY, 1920.

### Cash Recei d:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Dues:** | | |
| Lettish Federation | $ 188.40 | |
| Russian Federation | 421.20 | |
| Russian Federation Back Dues | 100.00 | 709.60 |
| Convention Assessments | 2374.83 | 2,374.83 |
| **Organization Fund:** | | |
| District II. | 89.00 | |
| District III. | 289.40 | |
| District IVc. | 57.75 | |
| District V. | 10.00 | |
| Philodelphia Lithuanian | 75.00 | |
| Ukrainian Federation | 500.00 | 1,000.15 |
| **Defense Stamps** | | |
| District III. | 10.00 | |
| Russian Federation | 48.75 | |
| N. Y. Lett. | 29.00 | 87.75 |
| **Defense Contribution** | | |
| District V. | 150.00 | 150.00 |
| **"Communist" Returns:** | | |
| District I. | 39.65 | |
| District III. | 6.00 | |
| District IVc. | 2.75 | |
| District V. | 1.00 | |
| Russian Federation | 25.00 | 74.30 |
| **Leaflets:** | | |
| District III. | 22.65 | 22.65 |
| Loan from Boston L. B. | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Returned on Com. Printing | 18.95 | |
| Returned on Contingency Fund | 15.00 | 33.95 |
| District Adjustments I. | 34.50 | |
| District Adjustments III. | 55.32 | |
| District Adjustments IVc. | 6.94 | |
| District Adjustments IVab. | 27.13 | |
| District Adjustments V. | 11.00 | 134.89 |
| Total Received in July | | 4,689.12 |
| Balance from June | | 931.17 |
| | | $5,620.29 |

## CASH PAID

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Expenses:** | | |
| Sundry | $ 35.97 | |
| Supplies | 8.00 | |
| Salaries | 460.00 | 504.57 |
| **Convention Expenses:** | | |
| Delegates | 1,433.50 | |
| Miscelaneous | 116.62 | 1,550.12 |
| **Traveling Expenses:** | | |
| District I. | 7.00 | |
| District II. | 2.00 | |
| District III. | 29.34 | |
| District IVab. | 63.91 | |
| District IVc. | 47.44 | |
| District V. | 3.97 | 153.66 |
| **District Miscl. Expenses:** | | |
| District I. | 11.56 | |
| District II. | 6.25 | |
| District III. | 4.53 | |
| District IVab. | 3.50 | |
| District IVc. | 5.00 | |
| District V. | 26.74 | 57.57 |
| **Salaries:** | | |
| District I. | 160.00 | |
| District II. | 285.00 | |
| District III. | 270.00 | |
| District IVab. | 215.00 | |
| District IVc. | 135.00 | |
| District V. | 205.00 | 1,270.00 |
| Communist Printing | 201.00 | |
| Editor | 225.00 | |
| Delivery | 6.25 | 432.25 |
| Lit. Printing | 225.00 | 225.00 |
| Leaflet Printing | 40.55 | 40.55 |
| International Delegates | 560.00 | 560.00 |
| C. E. C. Meeting | 86.71 | 86.71 |
| Office F. & F. | 76.50 | 76.50 |
| District Adjustments III. | 15.00 | |
| District Adjustments IV. | 200.00 | |
| District Adjustments V. | 360.26 | 575.26 |
| Total Paid in July | | 5,530.19 |
| Balance to August | | 90.10 |
| | | 5,620.29 |

---

**Have you contributed your One Day's Pay to carry on the Party work?**

---

## Boycott the Coming Elections.